



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/162,685	09/29/1998	HOWARD JUSTIN GLASER	ST9-98-052	9128

22462 7590 04/10/2002

GATES & COOPER LLP
HOWARD HUGHES CENTER
6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050
LOS ANGELES, CA 90045

EXAMINER

BASHORE, WILLIAM L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 04/10/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/162,685

Applicant(s)

GLASER ET AL

Examiner

William L. Bashore

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 5/21/2001, 1/23/2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). 10.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2176

DETAILED ACTION

1. It is noted that the previous Office Action (paper #7 - mailed 9/17/2001) is hereby vacated.
2. Applicant's amendment filed 1/23/2002 (with proof of mailing dated 5/22/2001) as paper #8, has now been entered and made of record.
3. Applicant's amendment filed 1/23/2002 as paper #9, has been entered and made of record.
4. The present Office Action addresses Applicant's Petition to Withdraw Finality filed 5/21/2001, amendment filed 5/22/2001, and amendment filed 1/23/2002.
5. Present application was filed on 9/29/1998.
6. Claims 1, 2, 12, 13 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.
7. Claims 2, 13, 24 remain objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.
8. Claims 1-8, 11-19, 22-30, 33-34 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foley, Arora, and Francis.
9. Claims 9-10, 20-21, 31-32 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foley, Arora, Francis, and Lisle.
10. Claims 1-34 are pending in this case. Claims 1, 12, 23, 34 are independent claims.

Drawings

11. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Art Unit: 2176

Specification

12. In regard to dependent claims 2, 13, 24, claims 2, 13, 24 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

13. Claims 1, 2, 12, 13, 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In regard to independent claims 1, 12, each of said claims contain the limitation phrase “*map the element from the form to the HTML file*” (underlining added). It is unclear as to which “form” this is referring to : “*a form that is in the HTML file*”, or “*transferred from a form to an HTML page*” (underlining added). Antecedent basis is unclear.

In regard to dependent claims 2, 13, the phrase “*from the form to the HTML page*” is vague and indefinite. It is unclear as to which “form” this refers to (see rejection to claims 1, 12 above).

Art Unit: 2176

In regard to independent claim 34, the phrase "*is capable of*" is vague and indefinite, because said phrase reflects indecisive claim language.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. Claims 1-8, 11-19, 22-30, 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foley et al. (hereinafter Foley), U.S. Patent No. 5,706,502 issued January 1998, in view of Arora et al. (hereinafter Arora), U.S. Patent No. 5,911,145 issued June 1999, and in view of Francis et al. (Hereinafter Francis), U.S. Patent No. 6,182,092 issued January 2001.

In regard to independent claim 1, Foley teaches:

- project files within a portfolio file, said portfolio file containing references to members of a set of project files, said project file containing a URL of an HTML file including an applet tag (Foley column 2 lines 55-63, column 8 lines 57-59, Figure 3 item 170A; compare with claim 1 "*reading information from a project file...*").

- Foley does not specifically teach a relationship between a form element and an HTML page and its associated HTML file. However, Francis teaches embedded form objects in an HTML page (said page possessing a file name), whereby a relationship between form objects within said HTML page is generated

Art Unit: 2176

with the help of a “Structured Language Element-to-Embeddable Object Class Association Table” (Francis column 4 lines 45-52, column 10 lines 53-64, column 14 lines 55-61; compare with claim 1 “...*the information comprising a relationship between an element that has been transferred from a form to an HTML page and the HTML file associated with the HTML page*”, and “*from the form*”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Francis to Foley, because of Francis’s taught advantage of defining relationships in order to provide editing of pages and forms within a single environment (as taught by Francis), to the single portfolio environment of Foley (See Francis column 4 lines 25-30).

- processing an applet referenced in each web document (Foley column 5 lines 32-49; compare with claim 1 “*processing the information to map the element to the HTML file*”).

- a graphical user interface in the form of a Java Workshop, including presented icon specifications and a toolbar (Foley Figure 1, column 4 lines 28-43). Francis teaches a relationship between form objects within said HTML page as previously discussed, above. Foley does not specifically teach the visual display between mapped elements and an HTML file. However, Arora teaches the displayed mapping of elements to an HTML page (Arora Abstract, column 10 lines 60-65, column 14 lines 32-36, Figures 22, 42). Compare the above with claim 1 “*displaying the mapping on a graphical user interface that includes the relationship between the element, the form, and the HTML file*”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Arora to Foley and Francis, because of the advantage of visibly showing mapped files, links, and objects of an HTML page in an organized fashion that Arora brings to Foley.

Art Unit: 2176

In regard to dependent claim 2, Foley does not specifically teach the use of a form in generating information from said form to an HTML page. However, Francis teaches an HTML page embedded at some point with form objects, and information is generated using a “Structured Language Element-to-Embeddable Object Class Association Table” (Francis column 4 lines 45-52, column 10 lines 53-64, column 14 lines 55-61; compare with claim 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Francis to Foley, because of Francis’s taught advantage of the analysis of embedded forms in order to clearly identify relationships withing the portfolio of Foley.

In regard to dependent claim 3, Foley teaches a visual element control (Foley column 6 lines 31-33; compare with claim 3 “*a visual control*”, and “*...group comprising a button*”).

Foley does not specifically teach selection from a picklist, and a data entry box. However, Arora teaches a picklist and a data entry box (Arora Figure 43; compare with claim 3 “*...a picklist, and a data entry box*”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Arora to Foley, because of the advantage of alternate forms of input that Arora brings to Foley.

In regard to dependent claim 4, Foley teaches an element name (Applet2), and an HTML file name (Applet2.htm) (Foley column 10 lines 35-45; compare with claim 4).

In regard to dependent claim 5, Foley teaches an element name (Applet2), and an HTML file name (Applet2.htm) (Foley column 10 lines 35-45). Foley does not specifically teach a form name. However, Francis teaches an HTML element with the name “FORM” (Francis column 10 lines 50-55; compare with claim 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply

Art Unit: 2176

Francis to Foley, because of Francis's taught advantage of form names in order to clearly identify elements within the portfolio of Foley.

In regard to dependent claim 6, Foley does not specifically teach an element name and an HTML name in a row of a table. However, Arora teaches a table comprising rows of names of elements, all of which belong to a products page (Arora column 14 lines 32-36, Figures 22, 42; compare with claim 6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Arora to Foley, because of the advantage of showing data in an organized fashion that Arora brings to Foley.

In regard to dependent claim 7, Foley does not specifically teach row and column cells for entry of a mapping. However, Arora teaches row and column cells for entry of a mapping (Arora Figure 39; compare with claim 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Arora to Foley, because of the advantage of showing space in a visually organized fashion that Arora brings to Foley.

In regard to dependent claim 8, claim 8 is rejected using the Examiner's argument and rationale as set forth in the rejection of dependent claim 6.

In regard to dependent claim 11, Foley teaches the managing and editing of portfolios comprising different projects (Foley Abstract, at top, column 11 lines 21-26; compare with claim 11).

In regard to independent claim 12, Foley teaches:

Art Unit: 2176

- project files within a portfolio file, said portfolio file containing references to members of a set of project files, said project file containing a URL of an HTML file including an applet tag (Foley column 2 lines 55-63, column 8 lines 57-59, Figure 3 item 170A; compare with claim 12 “*means for reading information from a project file...*”).

- Foley does not specifically teach a relationship between a form element and an HTML page and its associated HTML file. However, Francis teaches embedded form objects in an HTML page (said page possessing a file name), whereby a relationship between form objects within said HTML page is generated with the help of a “Structured Language Element-to-Embeddable Object Class Association Table” (Francis column 4 lines 45-52, column 10 lines 53-64, column 14 lines 55-61; compare with claim 12 “*...the information comprising a relationship between an element that has been transferred from a form to an HTML page and the HTML file associated with the HTML page , and “from the form”*”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Francis to Foley, because of Francis’s taught advantage of defining relationships in order to provide editing of pages and forms within a single environment (as taught by Francis), to the single portfolio environment of Foley (See Francis column 4 lines 25-30).

- processing an applet referenced in each web document (Foley column 5 lines 32-49; compare with claim 12 “*processing the information to map the element to the HTML file*”).

- a graphical user interface in the form of a Java Workshop, including presented icon specifications and a toolbar (Foley Figure 1, column 4 lines 28-43). Francis teaches a relationship between form objects within said HTML page as previously discussed, above. Foley does not specifically teach the visual display between mapped elements and an HTML file. However, Arora teaches the displayed mapping of elements to an HTML page (Arora Abstract, column 10 lines 60-65, column 14 lines 32-36, Figures 22, 42). Compare

Art Unit: 2176

the above with claim 12 “*displaying the mapping on a graphical user interface that includes the relationship between the element, the form, and the HTML file*”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Arora to Foley and Francis, because of the advantage of visibly showing mapped files, links, and objects of an HTML page in an organized fashion that Arora brings to Foley.

In regard to claims 13-19, 22, claims 13-19, 22 reflect the apparatus comprising computer readable instructions used to perform the methods as claimed in claims 2-8, 11, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to independent claim 23, Foley teaches:

- project files within a portfolio file, said portfolio file containing references to members of a set of project files, said project file containing a URL of an HTML file including an applet tag (Foley column 2 lines 55-63, column 8 lines 57-59, Figure 3 item 170A; compare with claim 23 “*reading information from a project file...*”).

- Foley does not specifically teach a relationship between a form element and an HTML page and its associated HTML file. However, Francis teaches embedded form objects in an HTML page (said page possessing a file name), whereby a relationship between form objects within said HTML page is generated with the help of a “Structured Language Element-to-Embeddable Object Class Association Table” (Francis column 4 lines 45-52, column 10 lines 53-64, column 14 lines 55-61; compare with claim 23 “*...the information comprising a relationship between an element that has been transferred from a form to an HTML page and the HTML file associated with the HTML page , and “from the form”*”). It would have been

Art Unit: 2176

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Francis to Foley, because of Francis's taught advantage of defining relationships in order to provide editing of pages and forms within a single environment (as taught by Francis), to the single portfolio environment of Foley (See Francis column 4 lines 25-30).

- processing an applet referenced in each web document (Foley column 5 lines 32-49; compare with claim 23 "*processing the information to map the element to the HTML file*").

- a graphical user interface in the form of a Java Workshop, including presented icon specifications and a toolbar (Foley Figure 1, column 4 lines 28-43). Francis teaches a relationship between form objects within said HTML page as previously discussed, above. Foley does not specifically teach the visual display between mapped elements and an HTML file. However, Arora teaches the displayed mapping of elements to an HTML page (Arora Abstract, column 10 lines 60-65, column 14 lines 32-36, Figures 22, 42). Compare the above with claim 23 "*displaying the mapping on a graphical user interface that includes the relationship between the element, the form, and the HTML file*"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Arora to Foley and Francis, because of the advantage of visibly showing mapped files, links, and objects of an HTML page in an organized fashion that Arora brings to Foley.

In regard to claims 24-30, 33, claims 24-30, 33 reflect the article of manufacture comprising computer readable instructions used to perform the methods as claimed in claims 2-8, 11, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to independent claim 34, Foley teaches:

Art Unit: 2176

- project files within a portfolio file, said portfolio file containing references to members of a set of project files, said project file containing a URL of an HTML file including an applet tag, and said elements of said portfolio can be saved, edited, processed and restored (Foley column 2 lines 55-63, column 5 lines 32-49, column 8 lines 57-59, Figure 3 item 170A; compare with claim 34: “*a computer readable data structure....the data structure comprising:*”, and “*a first section comprising the executable programming logic needed to load and execute the project application in the computer*”).

- Foley does not specifically teach a relationship between a form element and an HTML page and its associated HTML file. However, Francis teaches embedded form objects in an HTML page (said page possessing a file name), whereby a relationship between form objects within said HTML page is generated with the help of a “Structured Language Element-to-Embeddable Object Class Association Table” (Francis column 4 lines 45-52, column 10 lines 53-64, column 14 lines 55-61; compare with claim 34 “... storing information *comprising a relationship between an element that has been transferred from a form to an HTML page and the HTML file associated with the HTML page*”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Francis to Foley, because of Francis’s taught advantage of defining relationships in order to provide editing of pages and forms within a single environment (as taught by Francis), to the single portfolio environment of Foley (See Francis column 4 lines 25-30).

- Foley does not specifically teach the display of said mapped elements and HTML file shown within a project. However, Arora teaches the displayed mapping of elements to an HTML page (Arora column 14 lines 32-36, Figures 22, 42; compare with claim 34 “*a second section for storing data required to restore the project environment*”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

Art Unit: 2176

invention to apply Arora to Foley, because of the advantage of visibly showing mapped files, links, and objects of an HTML page in an organized fashion that Arora brings to Foley.

- a graphical user interface in the form of a Java Workshop, including presented icon specifications and a toolbar (Foley Figure 1, column 4 lines 28-43). Francis teaches a relationship between form objects within said HTML page as previously discussed, above. Foley does not specifically teach the visual display between mapped elements and an HTML file within a project. However, Arora teaches the displayed mapping of elements to an HTML page (Arora Abstract, column 10 lines 60-65, column 14 lines 32-36, Figures 22, 42). Compare the above with claim 34 "*wherein the relationship between the element, the form....in a graphical user interface*"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Arora to Foley and Francis, because of the advantage of visibly showing mapped files, links, and objects of an HTML page in an organized fashion that Arora brings to Foley.

16. Claims 9-10, 20-21, 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foley, Arora, and Francis as applied to claims 1, 12, 23 above, and further in view of Lisle et al. (hereinafter Lisle), U.S. Patent No. 6,069,630 issued May 2000.

In regard to dependent claim 9, Foley does not specifically teach flagging an invalid mapping. However, Lisle teaches the indication of a link depending upon whether a link (element) is good or bad (Lisle Figure 4 item 410; compare with claim 9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Lisle to Foley, because of the taught advantage up to date linking that Lisle provides to Foley.

Art Unit: 2176

In regard to dependent claim 10, claim 10 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 1 and 9, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to claims 20-21, claims 20-21 reflect the apparatus comprising computer readable instructions used to perform the methods as claimed in claims 9-10, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to claims 31-32, claims 31-32 reflect the article of manufacture comprising computer readable instructions used to perform the methods as claimed in claims 9-10, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Response to Argument

(Argument filed 1/23/2002 as paper #8, with proof of mailing: 5/22/2001)

17. Applicant's arguments filed 1/23/2002 (paper #8) have been fully and carefully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues on page 8 (at top) of the amendment that the cited art of references do not teach an element that has been transferred from a form to an HTML page, providing a mapping from an element transferred from a form to an HTML file associated with an HTML page, and displaying a mapping from an element to an HTML file in a graphical user interface that indicates the relationship between the element, the form, and the HTML file. Applicant also argues on page 8 (at bottom) to page 9 (at top) of the amendment that Francis's Table is merely a list of tag components and an identifier for an object used to create a component. The examiner notes that Francis teaches embedded form objects in an HTML page (said page

Art Unit: 2176

possessing a file name), whereby a relationship between form objects within said HTML page is generated with the help of said Table. Francis teaches a class identifier identifying an object selected according to a selected tag component (e.g., an HTML tag name) of the structured language element with reference to said Table (Francis column 4 lines 45-50). Francis teaches HTML tag names as form tag names (Francis column 10 lines 50-60, column 15 lines 40-50), and teaches *"a relationship between an element that has been transferred from a form to an HTML page and the HTML file associated with the HTML page"*.

Applicant argues on page 9 of the amendment that the cited art of references do not teach mapping an element to an HTML file. The examiner notes that Foley teaches project files. Francis teaches mapping between HTML form tag elements and an HTML file.

Applicant argues on page 10 of the amendment that Arora does not teach mapping an element to an HTML file. The examiner notes that Arora teaches the displayed mapping of elements to an HTML page (Arora column 14 lines 32-36, Figures 22, 42). In additional support of this rejection, Arora teaches a structure editor for Websites, including defining the layout of each page in a site (Arora Abstract). Arora also teaches a page editor including values of Properties window (properties for a displayed page) (Arora column 10 lines 61-67), and a list of draw objects (Arora column 11 lines 7-20).

(Argument filed 1/23/2002 as paper #9)

18. Applicant's arguments filed 1/23/2002 (paper #9) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant references interviews conducted with the Examiner and Supervisor Heather Herndon on page 7, section I - Introduction, of the amendment. The Examiner and his Supervisor note that Applicant made a number of calls of inquiry regarding the status of the pending application. The Examiner notes that

Art Unit: 2176

since the merits of the case were not discussed, these calls were not considered "interviews", therefore interview summaries were not considered necessary, other than the interview summary faxed on 8/22/2001. An official paper of this interview summary is mailed with the present action (see MPEP 713.01 and 713.04).

Applicant references numerous telephone interviews between attorney Jason Feldmar, Examiner Bashore, and Supervisor Heather Herndon in connection with the present patent application, in particular June 20, 2001, July 11, 2001, a message on August 21, 2001, an interview of August 22, 2001, and December 12, 2001 (page 7-8 section II of the amendment). Again, it is noted by Examiner Bashore and his Supervisor that these were calls of inquiry. Since the merits of the case were not discussed, the Examiner does not consider these calls as "interviews", therefore interview summaries were not considered necessary, other than that which was faxed on 8/22/2001. An official paper of this interview summary is mailed with the present action (see MPEP 713.01 and 713.04).

Applicant traverses the Examiner's objection of claims 2, 13, 24 under CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant argues on page 8 (section VIII - Non Art Rejection) of the amendment that dependent claims 2, 13, 24 provide a timing element, therefore providing a further limitation of the independent claims. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner notes that Applicant appears to contradict his own position set forth in Petition Under 37 C.F.R. 1.181 to invoke Supervisory Authority (filed 5/21/2001 as paper #5). Page 2 of said petition states in part:

"The Applicants' amendment of the claims merely amended the independent claims to incorporate dependent claim limitations. For example, the independent claims

Art Unit: 2176

1, 12, 23 were amended to include a limitation such that the element was transferred from a form to an HTML page and an HTML file associated with the HTML page, which limitation was incorporation from dependent claims 2, 13 and 24 respectively of the application as originally filed”.

Using claims 1, and 2 as an example, the relevant limitation of claim 1 states:

“reading information from a project file, the information comprising a relationship between an element that has been transferred from a form to an HTML page and the HTML file associated with the HTML page”.

Dependent claim 2 states:

“The method of claim 1, wherein the information is generated when the element is transferred from the form to the HTML page associated with the HTML file.”

The Examiner does not see any evidence of claim 2 further limiting the subject matter of independent claim 1.

This equally applies to claim 13 (dependent from claim 12), and claim 24 (dependent from claim 23).

Conclusion

19. **Prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to disclosure.**

Fong et al.	U.S. Patent No. 6,279,015	issued	08/2001
-------------	---------------------------	--------	---------

Art Unit: 2176

20. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William Bashore whose telephone number is (703) 308-5807. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 11:30 AM to 8:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (703) 308-5186.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

21. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 746-7239 (for formal communications intended for entry)

or:


(703) 746-7240 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

or:

(703) 746-7238 (for after-final communications)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

William L. Bashore
04/01/2002


STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER